

medieval & renaissance
texts & studies

VOLUME 74



Sources of Anglo-Saxon
Literary Culture:
A Trial Version

Edited by

FREDERICK M. BIGGS

THOMAS D. HILL

PAUL E. SZARMACH

with the assistance of

KAREN HAMMOND

Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies
State University of New York at Binghamton
Binghamton, New York
1990

The preparation of this volume was made possible (in part)
by a grant from the Division of Research Programs
of the National Endowment for the Humanities,
an independent federal agency.

© Copyright 1990
Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies
State University of New York at Binghamton

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Sources of Anglo-Saxon literary culture : a trial version /
edited by Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, Paul E.
Szarmach, with the assistance of Karen Hammond.

p. cm.—(Medieval & Renaissance texts & studies ;
v. 74)

ISBN 0-86698-084-9

1. English literature—Old English, ca. 450-1100—
Bibliography. 2. Civilization, Anglo-Saxon—Sources—
Bibliography. I. Biggs, Frederick M. II. Hill,
Thomas D., 1940- III. Szarmach, Paul E., 1941- .
IV. State University of New York at Binghamton. Center for
Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies. V. Series.
Z2012.S58 1990
[PR173]
016.829—dc20

89-13621
CIP

This book is made to last.
It is set in Baskerville, smythe-sewn,
and printed on acid-free paper
to library specifications.

Printed in the United States of America

Table of Contents

FOREWORD	vii
PAUL E. SZARMACH	
INTRODUCTION	xv
THOMAS D. HILL	
GUIDE for READERS	xxxi
FREDERICK M. BIGGS	
ENTRIES	
Acta Sanctorum	1
Ado of Vienne	16
Ælfric of Eynsham	16
Alcuin	19
Apocrypha	22
Augustine	71
Bede	72
(Old English) Bede	73
Boethius	74
(PS Boethius)	79
Cyprianus Gallus	80
Blossius Aemelius Dracontius	82
Grammarians	84
Hiberno-Latin and Irish-Influenced Biblical Commentaries, Florilegia, and Homily Collections	87

Homiliaries and Homilies	123
Anonymous Old English Homilies	124
Hrabanus Maurus	130
Laurence of Novara	133
Laws	134
Liturgy	135
Prayers	135
Medical Texts	140
Orosius	141
Paschasius Radbertus	143
Paulinus of Nola	144
Priscian	146
Proba	149
Prudentius	150
Ralph d'Escures	157
Ratramnus	157
Sulpicius Severus	158
Vegetius Renatus, Flavius	161
Vitae Patrum	162
BIBLIOGRAPHY PART I	167
BIBLIOGRAPHY PART II	177
APPENDIX A	
Martyrology	207
APPENDIX B	
Projected Entries and Contributors List	221
APPENDIX C	
SASLC <i>Acta Sanctorum</i> List of Saints	239

Foreword

The *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture* (SASLC) is a collaborative project that aims to produce a reference work summarizing current scholarship concerning the knowledge and use of literary sources in Anglo-Saxon England. Departing from J.D.A. Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English, 597-1066* and incorporating more recent scholarship, the SASLC volume will include contributions from specialists in the various sub-fields of Old English studies. The book is intended to complement other research tools that are either completed or in progress, viz. the *Dictionary of Old English*, the Greenfield-Robinson *Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature to 1972*, and the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*. When completed, the work of SASLC will exist in multiple forms: codex book, diskette, and loose-leaf binder. The rationale for these different forms is to encourage a continuing process of revision and correction.

This volume is a *Trial Version* of the final work. Since the usefulness of a "partial" reference tool could be questioned, it might be appropriate to stress the several purposes here intended. As a preliminary publication in anticipation of the complete volume, this version seeks to serve these set purposes: 1) a test-run for editorial procedures, including input, layout and design; 2) a public document released to solicit even wider field criticism than the project committee has already sought; 3) an efficient sample of the project that will stimulate wider participation from scholars working in Anglo-Saxon studies and related fields; 4) a partial record of work done in the first two years of the project; 5) a publication for many who have successfully participated in the project thus far. There is a sixth and more general aim, which will naturally be more fully realized by the complete volume: to stimulate source work in the field by calling attention to what has been accomplished thus far and to the vast amount of work still remaining to be done. Furthermore, in reviewing the various entries submitted to SASLC so far, the members of the Advisory Committee and the editors of this volume have had privileged access to several up-to-date scholarly summaries of what is known about books and authors known to the English. It seems

to be in the best tradition of scholarship to share this work at the earliest opportunity within the practical limits imposed by funding constraints. The entries here published for *Apocrypha* and *Hiberno-Latin* . . . are clear and evident examples of such work, which supersede any earlier attempts to collect and present similar information regarding the works or authors concerned. The emphasis in this *Trial Version* is, therefore, on *process*, i.e., the notion that publication of source work is never definitive and final, but rather a continuing process, requiring not rigid dogmatism but rather an openness to new possibilities. The word processor is accordingly both a practical aid supporting this research tool and a metaphor signaling that the next revision is at hand. The committee is aware that this volume is incomplete and that readers will find this *Trial Version* inconvenient in several regards; readers should rest assured, however, that the system of cross-referencing will be expanded in the final, complete volume and that the final volume will include extensive indices.

In the Introduction immediately following this Foreword, Thomas D. Hill presents the intellectual rationale and methodology behind the project. Here I seek only to sketch the administrative history to date and projected future plans.

History of the Project

SASLC is a direct outcome of the 1983 Symposium on the Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture, held at the Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University, which was co-sponsored by the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies (CEMERS), State University of New York at Binghamton, and granted major funding by the National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Research Programs. The proceedings of this first Symposium appear as *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture*, Studies in Medieval Culture 20 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1986). The Symposium, now continuing into its eighth year (1990), sought at its inaugural meeting to focus on three sub-fields in Anglo-Saxon Studies, namely literary culture, iconography, and archaeology, and to consider new directions. Discussions in literary culture, which is by far the dominant area of interest in North America, focussed on questions of methodology, the usefulness and availability of research tools, and advances in manuscript studies. While a transcript of the open discussion and a record of many informal meetings would reveal specific points of interchange and several new ideas, a strong consensus developed that under the right conditions the development of a successor volume to Ogilvy's *Books Known* would meet the apparent greatest need.

This first Symposium stimulated activity in Great Britain, serving as the forerunner for a Conference at Leeds University in March, 1984 organized by Joyce Hill and J.E. Cross. Before long the British initiative took a different direction, viz., towards a very large scale, multi-volume project encompassing all vernacular and Latin works, organized on a different principle, i.e., that of identifying, listing, and excerpting for a database all the sources used in the creation of works produced in Anglo-Saxon England. Thus, in contrast to *SASLC*, which works forward from classical, patristic, and medieval sources seeking to summarize the most convincing evidence for their being known or used in Anglo-Saxon England, the British-based *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* will work backwards from each Anglo-Saxon text, establishing wherever possible the immediate source of each passage. *SASLC* and *Fontes* are thus in inverse relation. Unlike *SASLC*, *Fontes* aims to establish new source relationships. The scale envisioned by the *Fontes* initiative will require two or three decades of work and many scholars committed to specific volumes. At this writing, *Fontes* is well under way with an incipient data base at Manchester University. In organizational parallel with *SASLC*, the *Fontes* group meets annually in March at a rotating site for a public meeting and conference to discuss the progress of the project. There are annual fall meetings for the *Fontes* Executive Committee, in which *SASLC* Administrative Committee members have actively participated. One happy and tangible piece of evidence for the spirit of cooperation is the joint sponsorship of the publication of Michael Lapidge's *Abbreviations for Sources and Specification of Standard Editions for Sources* (1988), which has served as a working document assisting both projects. The Lapidge list has served as the basis for this volume's Bibliography Part I.

To support the first two years of *SASLC* (1987-89), the National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Research, awarded a major grant. As the project committee began to work out the practicalities of the project and to refine specifics of its original plan, issuing invitations to participate to a broad base of scholars and soliciting criticism of various ideas, it also saw how *SASLC* could evolve into a considerably more useful tool than had originally been proposed. The project committee instituted several major design changes; the most thoroughgoing change was the addition of a headnote for each entry, consisting of five distinct categories of basic information about a work's currency among the Anglo-Saxons, i.e., manuscripts, Anglo-Saxon booklists, Anglo-Saxon versions, quotations/citations/echoes, and references. The gathering and weighing of information to be provided under these headings have naturally complicated the work of the contributors and extended the life of the project. The grand strategy for the *SASLC* volume has concomitantly changed. In almost all cases *SASLC* entries have become new creations rather than mere corrections of Ogilvy's *Books Known*.

All these changes were welcomed by the full Advisory Committee at successive meetings, and likewise endorsed by colleagues in the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*. The committee hopes that the revised format will elicit a similar positive reaction from students, scholars in general, and Anglo-Saxonists who will use this *Trial Version* and the ultimate volume. As indicated above, a major purpose of this *Trial Version* is to solicit the reactions of reader-users to the usefulness of the entries, as now designed.

Present and Future Plans

The current academic year (1989-90) is the third year of the project. Operating under a no-cost extension of the original NEH grant and receiving further incidental support from the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies at SUNY-Binghamton, SASLC should come by year's end to the completion of all major entries and to almost all minor entries. For the completion of the core of the project, SASLC will rely heavily on committees of research supervised by Thomas D. Hill (Cornell) and Charles Wright (Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), whose home departments will offer support. The current revised plan calls for a fourth and fifth year of the project to present a reasonably comprehensive treatment of saints' lives and liturgy, two special areas in the study of Anglo-Saxon literary culture that offer daunting complexities. Particularly problematic for Anglo-Saxonists is the reality that most reference works in the field of hagiography, including the Bollandists' guides to hagiographical texts and manuscripts, are keyed to continental sources and collections. One result of this situation is that Anglo-Saxonists have been forced to rely, for Latin sources of Old English texts, on misleading editions based on non-insular manuscripts. SASLC's *Acta Sanctorum* will constitute the first effort to produce a comprehensive survey of the versions and manuscripts the Anglo-Saxons possessed and used in their study and composition of hagiographical texts. Already the *Acta Sanctorum* database set up by Gordon Whatley contains provisions for 330 entries on the basis of a preliminary survey of the most accessible large-scale sources of evidence. It is expected that the SASLC format, by virtue of its rigor, its general design, and the information it provides can inspire and facilitate a new understanding of early medieval hagiography from the Anglo-Saxon perspective. This *Trial Version* offers thirteen sample entries treating saints' lives.

The Liturgy in the Anglo-Saxon period offers its own complexities. In this area of study SASLC cannot simply rely on what has survived, but rather it will have to exercise an informed imagination controlled by such facts

as can be established in order to present in full dimension the variety of matters gathered under the heading "Liturgy." For Richard Pfaff and the research team he will assemble for this last major task for SASLC, the challenge will be to establish an adequate framework for understanding the dimensions of possible liturgical influence during the whole of the period.

An Invitation

At this time more than 60 scholars from the international community have contributed or promised to contribute entries for SASLC. While a large, collaborative project poses many practical problems of administration and coordination, such a design nevertheless has the great advantage of employing specialist contributors for individual authors, works, or genres. The end result for the volume should be the best work by the best qualified scholars. Even with the many willing hands now working for SASLC out of a common, sustained, and shared purpose, the project can still benefit from more scholars interested in sources. Thus, the committee invites those interested to write for further information. There are still minor entries awaiting their writers. Clearly, the project needs contributors to its major sections on Saints' Lives and Liturgy. Appendices B and C, which give a List of Entries and a List of Saints respectively, suggest the scope of work. Now, as always, the project can use expert criticism and reading of entries that are in hand.

For further information on SASLC write to:

Prof. Paul E. Szarmach
Project Director, SASLC
CEMERS; SUNY-Binghamton
P.O. Box 6000
Binghamton, NY 13902-6000
PHONE: 607-777-2730

Acknowledgments

As Project Director I have the very happy task to acknowledge the many colleagues who have made various contributions to SASLC. It was J.E. Cross who first mobilized Anglo-Saxonists in North America to consider creat-

ing a successor volume to Ogilvy's *Books Known*; his enthusiasm, his vision, and his power to persuade others to take on this work form the true beginning. J.D.A. Ogilvy himself gave the project his blessing with that same openness and warmth that one can still see in his pioneering book. Certainly the original 1983 Symposium and its continuation, which have served in parallel to sustain and advance *SASLC*, has been possible through the generosity of Otto Gründler, Director of the Medieval Institute at Western Michigan University. Mario A. DiCesare, Director and General Editor of *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, willingly took *SASLC* on with that same spirited devotion to traditional scholarship in its newer form that has inspired his colleagues and ever furnished me with personal example. While noting some in the *SASLC* network with special praise, I mean not to slight others, but I must thank Thomas D. Hill and Frederick M. Biggs. The former has on countless occasions offered sane and sensible advice for the large and the small of this enterprise, while the latter has been the real dynamo behind it. *SASLC* would have remained only an idea without them. The National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Research, has been our support and our patron, demonstrating through its staff a sympathy and understanding of our goals and needs. At Binghamton the CEMERS Secretary Ann DiStefano and graduate assistants Deborah Mitchell and Cheryl Gravis have greatly advanced the day-to-day details of the project. There are many scholars who have contributed entries to *SASLC*, not all of whose work, given the funding and the timing, can receive the credit due. George H. Brown, Joseph F. Kelly, and Vivien Law, whose three contributions on (respectively) Bede, Augustine, and Grammar (Grammatical Writings) could easily have formed a book, are, among others, represented only in part here because of technical limitations. To these and to the many whose contributions we could not include in full or in any form, I and my co-editors owe a debt of thanks.

Paul E. Szarmach

PROJECT COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Administrative Committee:

Frederick M. Biggs (Univ. of Connecticut)
 Thomas D. Hill (Cornell Univ.)
 Thomas Mackay (Brigham Young Univ.)
 Paul E. Szarmach (SUNY-Binghamton)
 E. Gordon Whatley (Queens College, CUNY)

Advisory Committee:

Janet M. Bately (Univ. of London King's College)
 Carl T. Berkhout (Univ. of Arizona)
 J.E. Cross (Univ. of Liverpool)
 Antonette di Paolo Healey (Univ. of Toronto)
 Michael Lapidge (Univ. of Cambridge)
 Mary P. Richards (Auburn Univ.)
 Donald G. Scragg (Manchester Univ.)
 Joseph Wittig (Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
 David Yerkes (Columbia University)

Special Consultants:

Richard W. Pfaff (Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
 Charles D. Wright (Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

The Administrative Committee has general responsibility for the implementation of the plan of work, while the Advisory Committee reviews and comments on various aspects of the new reference tool with the assistance of the Special Consultants.

Introduction

The predecessor and inspiration for our present volume is J.D.A. Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English, 597-1066*, whose title neatly synopsisized the aims of his collection. Our title is vaguer and more amorphous—in part because it was composed by a committee and in part because our goals are less easily defined. Ogilvy was concerned simply with “books”—with Latin texts transcribed and transmitted in the Anglo-Saxon period—whereas we are interested more broadly in “sources,” including oral traditional literature as well as written texts, and in written texts such as charters, medical recipes, and charms which can only be loosely described as books. These concerns necessitated a new, somewhat more inclusive title, and it was necessary to distinguish our project from his in any case; but we have lost something in the change. Since our title no longer speaks for itself with the brisk assurance of Ogilvy's, and since the user of the Guide needs some general orientation in any case, this essay is intended to serve as an introduction to the entries gathered here. The present reference volume is a collaborative endeavor; it consists of a collection of single entries by numerous scholars and obviously reflects diverse scholarly opinion. This introduction, in contrast, is written by one individual; and it should be emphasized that the views expressed in the introduction—to the degree that they are not merely platitudes—are those of a single individual, who has, however, received enough commentary and criticism over a period of time that he feels it is appropriate to use the editorial first person plural. What we hope to accomplish in this introduction is a definition of certain key terms, a guide and warning to users, and a prospectus concerning the objectives of this particular kind of scholarly inquiry—to put it simply, why we think source scholarship is valid and worth consolidating in a reference work of this kind.

Methodology

Since the terms "source" and "influence" are used with a good deal of freedom in literary scholarship, let us begin by defining a literary source and its derivative as a particular mode of textual relationship. The first step in establishing such a relationship is to demonstrate parallels between two texts which are so striking that to assume they were fortuitous would "outrage probability," to use R.E. Kaske's phrase. Once such parallels have been established, the next step is to evaluate the historical relationship of the two texts and to determine the kind and direction of influence that these parallels imply. In principle, at least, it might be possible to distinguish between a source and a text derived from it on the basis of careful analysis of the idiom, style, and structure of the two texts. But in practice scholars rely on such analyses only when external historical evidence is not available. And our assumptions about the larger historical context in which a given text was composed can affect our interpretation of apparently straightforward evidence. Thus, given textual parallels between some of the homilies of Augustine's *Tractatus in evangelium Ioannis* and certain of Ælfric's homilies, the conclusion that Augustine is the source and Ælfric derivative is determined not by analysis of the texts themselves, but by our knowledge of the historical relationship of the two texts. This example is obviously a very simple one. No one has yet proposed that Ælfric influenced Augustine. But it is important to emphasize at the outset that defining source relationships is not as simple as it might seem; one must always consider questions of historical and literary context. To take a suppositious example, parallels of exactly the same sort as those between Augustine and Ælfric which involved an Anglo-Saxon and a Greek text would not necessarily be accepted as proof that the latter was the source of the former. The probability of some Latin intermediary would seem a more plausible way of accounting for the parallels than the assumption that an Anglo-Saxon author knew Greek. But at the same time the assumption that the Anglo-Saxons were Greekless can become a self-fulfilling prophecy if all parallels between Anglo-Saxon and Greek texts are explained away by hypothesizing lost Latin intermediaries. For a variety of reasons, the current working assumption of most Anglo-Saxonists that the Anglo-Saxons were generally ignorant of Greek seems to us plausible, but source-scholars must be sensitive to the fact that this is an assumption, and an assumption that shapes the way they understand the "raw" data of textual relationships.

We have referred to "striking textual parallels," but must concede that defining such parallels is a matter of intuitive judgment and that the range of potential ambiguity and subjectivity is wide. The fact remains, however, that many thousands of such textual relationships have been adduced in

the fields of Old and Middle English scholarship alone, and have never seriously been questioned. The appeal to the *consensus omnium* may not be an elegant or sophisticated mode of scholarly argument, but it has its force. If we were asked to define our working methodology, we would respond that source scholarship involves a kind of dialectical process in which individual scholars propose source relationships on the basis of intuitive judgment, and these judgments are then either confirmed or denied by the consensus of scholars who take the trouble to evaluate the argument and the supporting evidence. Such a consensus may not be reached quickly if the source relationship is difficult for one reason or another, or if the text involved is obscure. But in principle, once a number of scholars who have no immediate reason to be prejudiced have examined the evidence, a consensus, or at the least an agenda for further research, can be reached.

Implicit in this methodology is the assumption that a "true" definition of a given source relationship is both desirable and in principle attainable, but it must also be clearly acknowledged, that given the limitations of documentation during this period, even the best-established and most secure examples of source-relationships are provisional and open to correction and modification. If Ælfric drew on Augustine's *Tractatus in evangelium Ioannis*, there remains the question of what version of the text of those homilies was accessible to him, or whether Ælfric's choice of available synonyms in translation was influenced by a previous tradition of glossing; and this list of hypothetical discoveries, which might complicate the apparently simple literary-historical fact that Ælfric used Augustine on John, could be extended almost indefinitely. Scholars may believe that in certain areas of Anglo-Saxon literary source scholarship the work has been pretty thoroughly done, but there is always the possibility of surprising new finds.

Terminology

Apart from the provisional character of source scholarship in the field of Old English and Anglo-Latin literature, another immediate problem that must concern us is that there is no established terminology to distinguish among the many possible modes of relationship between two or more texts which may obtain in any given case. For practical purposes we propose to stipulate some working definitions. In literary-historical discourse a source can consist of as little as one word or as much as thousands of lines of text. Indeed, many Anglo-Saxon texts are wholly dependent on one specific source and are conventionally defined as translations or versions of an original. But in ordinary usage the term "source" generally refers

to a text that provides the antecedent for some significant portion of a derivative text, while the terms "citation," "quotation," "allusion," or "echo" refer to smaller and more limited instances of similar textual relationships. These less-extended verbal parallels are sometimes indicated in some explicit fashion comparable to the modern device of using quotation marks. But in both vernacular and Christian-Latin literary tradition the concept of authorial proprietorship was less clearly defined than it is in the modern English literary tradition, and authors would often draw passages from antecedent texts without such acknowledgment. For present purposes a "citation" is defined as a passage which is prefaced or concluded by a reference to the author or text from which the quotation is drawn. A "quotation" by contrast need not include such a reference. Even briefer instances of parallel textual relationships are "allusions" or "echoes," the former consisting of words, phrases or larger units of discourse that purposefully recall some particular antecedent text, and the latter consisting of such parallels that occur simply because one author is so thoroughly familiar with some antecedent text that he echoes it unconsciously and inadvertently. In principle it might be possible to distinguish clearly between these various modes of textual relationship, but in practice it can be very difficult to distinguish between a deliberate allusion, intended to call to mind some particular antecedent text, and an echo. For the immediate purposes of this study and in the context of literary-historical discourse, the distinction is not as important as it might seem, since either allusions or echoes reflect the fact that a given author was familiar with a specific source, but readers who consult the various editions and literary handbooks must be aware that there is a good deal of editorial judgment involved in such discriminations.

Problems of Textual Identity

A further problem involving definition concerns the question of the definition of the text itself, or textual identity. In the modern world the question is a comparatively simple one. An individual author writes a specific text and ultimately "authorizes" its publication in a particular form. The specific form of the text presumably reflects the author's intention—a useful if much debated term—and this particular form of the text is reproduced mechanically and disseminated as widely as the economics of publication permit. Anglo-Saxon literary culture reflects the influence of two originally quite discrete literary traditions—Germanic and Christian-Latin—and the concept of textual identity was rather different from the modern one in both traditions. Germanic literary tradition was in large part an oral

one, and without prejudicing the much-discussed question of the character and nature of this tradition, it is clear that a "text" that exists in oral tradition exists in a radically different context than in contemporary "literate" tradition.

As far as the Christian-Latin tradition is concerned, the tradition with which we are for the most part concerned in this study, the issue of textual identity is more immediately apprehensible but still raises problems. The Anglo-Saxons knew and understood the concept of textual identity as we understand it—the concept of a text fixed and determined by the intention of an individual author—but the vagaries of early medieval book production, along with scribal practice and the particular circumstances of both vernacular and Anglo-Latin literary culture, frequently complicate the issue of textual identity enormously. A conscientious scholar such as Bede was aware of the problem of textual variation and corruption, and such scholars attempted to correct and correctly identify the texts with which they were dealing. But lesser scholars were less conscientious, and in any case it was necessary to have both good texts and good judgment to correct the faults of one's exemplar. Textual corruption was as a result endemic, and confusion about attribution and canonicity was simply part of the intellectual culture of the period. It could indeed be argued that modern scholarship is still affected by errors deriving from this period. Migne's *Patrologia Latina* is in large part a reprint of sixteenth and seventeenth century editions of Christian-Latin authors, and these editions in turn were often simply based on "old," i.e., early medieval manuscripts. The misattributions and textual confusions that have plagued scholars attempting to work with that monumental collection are in part a direct heritage of the scholarship of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Thus when one is faced with an apparently simple problem of source-scholarship—whether a given Anglo-Saxon author knew a particular classical or patristic text—the first question which must be raised is in what form the text in question might have been circulated. To take a specific example that illustrates something of the complexity of these issues, the Bible was, as it still is, a central text in Catholic Christian culture. Biblical influence is pervasive in the Christian literature of this period. But as one also might expect in a manuscript culture in which every text had to be copied out by hand, there are relatively few manuscripts of the Bible as we would define it—the full text of the Old and New Testaments from beginning to end. Psalters and Gospels, however—texts that could be used in the liturgy—are relatively abundant, and there is a good deal of evidence that Anglo-Saxons would have been especially familiar with the Bible in the form in which it was read in the services. There is also some evidence of the study of specific biblical texts both in Latin and in the ver-

nacular, and interest in the Bible as a historical text, particularly as a record of the earliest events of human history. Again, there is a good deal of biblical legal material transcribed into Anglo-Saxon law. And, finally, there are biblical texts included in sapiential collections, in contexts in which it is very difficult to know whether the collector or scribe recognized the fact that a given maxim or "sentence" was in fact biblical. Certainly the reader would have no way of knowing the difference between a biblical maxim and one drawn from the Fathers or some similar source in such collections. The text of the Bible thus existed not only in formal monumental codices, but also in a variety of other forms as well, and the fact that a given text has a biblical source does not fully answer the more specific question of what particular kind of text a given poet or homilist might have had in front of him.

In one way or another the problem of textual identity has arisen in virtually every entry in this handbook. The problem may be as simple as when and where a given text begins and ends, or it may involve such virtually unresolvable issues as at what point the process of abridgment, alteration, and scribal error creates a "new" text rather than a "version" of a given exemplar. In such matters the authors of specific entries have simply exercised their best judgment; when appropriate they have attempted to warn users of such problems in the body of their entries. In some genres in particular, the problem of textual identity has been particularly difficult. Texts in the wisdom literature tradition, for example, which consist of a series of "wise" and often enigmatic sayings or homilies—particularly the loosely structured homilies of the anonymous tradition—can sometimes be very hard to define in terms of their specific textual identity. In fact it could be argued that such texts should be viewed as improvisations on a theme rather than fixed textual discourse with a clearly defined beginning and end. But for practical purposes the authors of the various entries have had to treat all of these various literary forms as if they were fixed textual entities comparable to a modern text. As long as it is clearly recognized that this is simply a convenient working assumption—that texts such as the *De duodecim abusivis sæculi* or the *Apocalypse of Thomas* did not circulate in a single authorized version, and that an edition of a single version of these texts would misrepresent the way in which most medieval readers had access to them—then the readers of these entries can use the information gathered without serious misapprehension. But it must be emphasized that even in the Christian-Latin tradition various texts existed in quite different modes of textual identity, and that while some of these texts were indeed "books" in Ogilvy's sense and ours, some were not.

Limitations of Evidence

A question that must be faced is how the readers of this volume may make use of the evidence that the authors of the various entries have gathered together. The answer is a simple one: with great caution. This caution must extend both to the evidence itself and to what significance to attach to it. As editors and authors, we have made every effort to be accurate, but errors are inevitable in these entries—particularly errors of omission. Ideally the author of any given entry should review the corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Latin literature in order to verify that the list of references provided in the entry is as inclusive as possible. In practice we have not been able to accomplish any such effort at verification; and indeed the editorial decision not to include newly discovered source findings has meant that even if a contributor were able to add to our current knowledge of source relationships, he or she could not ordinarily do so in the entry prepared for this volume. Thus errors of omission are inevitable and inevitably common in these entries; in fact one of the goals of this project is to indicate where the lacunae are by presenting the available evidence in summary form. To take a specific example, there is evidence for the availability of the political and sapiential text, *De duodecim abusivis sæculi*, before the Viking invasions because Alcuin quoted from it, and evidence that it was known in the later period because Ælfric quoted from it and either Ælfric or someone in Ælfric's circle translated an abbreviated version of this treatise. But one naturally wonders whether the text was known in the intervening years—whether the Anglo-Saxons were reading it in the generations between Alcuin and Ælfric. At present we have no clearcut evidence of the currency of this treatise during this period, and this lacuna is evident in the presentation of our evidence. But the text in question was a popular one, and we expect that further evidence of its use will turn up, and that whoever discovers this evidence will be alerted to its significance by the lacunae in our entry.

"New" Source Scholarship

A related issue that requires some discussion is the editorial decision not to include unpublished source discoveries in our entries. In part this decision is motivated by the editorial concern that if we accept and implicitly sanction original source scholarship by our authors, the project may be extended indefinitely. For better or worse all of the entries completed so far have suggested significant new lines of research to their authors and

one logical extension of this development is a project without a clearcut terminus. Another somewhat more principled reason for not including new research is that source scholarship, like any other branch of scholarship, requires a process of review and assimilation. To encourage contributors to present the results of their own scholarship in a reference work without the benefit of this process would weaken rather than strengthen scholarship in this area. There are many journals that publish source scholarship in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Latin literature, and we therefore see no need to make the present volume a vehicle for new research. While this principle governs the guidelines for authors of entries, we have made exceptions on occasion, and scholars have been generous in communicating to us the results of research which have been accepted for publication but are not yet in print.

Paleography

Another problem which the users of this volume must consider is that while the format of the entries we have chosen gives a certain prominence to the manuscript evidence, a very important kind of evidence, to be sure there are certain immediate problems with the witness of the manuscripts in themselves. The first is that interpreting it depends upon the judgment of paleographers, a judgment which is ultimately as subjective and fallible as that of scholars in any other discipline. In the present volume we have simply accepted the dating and locations suggested by the paleographers and catalogers of the major collections. It is important to bear in mind that while we have reproduced this information and have in some instances based our discussions upon it, we have not ordinarily independently verified it. Although all of the members of the editorial board have at least some experience of working with manuscripts, no member is a paleographer in terms of scholarly specialization. Here as elsewhere we have been concerned not with attempting to provide new information for the present volume, but rather with codifying and gathering received scholarly opinion as of the time of publication. What this means in practical terms is that when users of this volume notice that the evidence for the currency of a certain work is dependent on limited or ambiguous paleographical evidence, then it is important that they examine the evidence and the argumentation for themselves. Error or unwarranted dogmatism on the part of the paleographers we have quoted are, of course, obvious problems; but a more subtle source of confusion is that scholarly qualifications and hesitations tend to be suppressed in transition from one scholarly work to

another. If a paleographer discusses a problem of dating at some length and in the end with some reluctance opts for a particular date, the hesitations and in particular the degree of hesitation he or she may have about assigning a particular date are not adequately expressed in the conventional notation we have accepted from our predecessors. Thus a notation like "10c Worcester?" can mean anything from "this is the paleographer's opinion but he is not absolutely certain" to "if forced to hazard an opinion, the paleographer would desperately offer the above-mentioned." As in other areas of scholarship, part of the object of the present volume is to focus attention on possible areas of fruitful scholarly investigation, and the numerous occasions of reticence and the question-marks that adorn our entries can at least illustrate the limitations of our knowledge with graphic clarity.

Literary History

Even when the paleographers agree about the place and the date—or, as more often happens, about a range of possible places and dates which would accord with the evidence of a manuscript—it is still necessary to interpret the evidence of the manuscript in specifically literary terms. If we have, for example, a manuscript of Vergil's *Aeneid* which appears to have been copied by an Anglo-Saxon scribe, does the format and the presentation of the text suggest that the scribe understood what he was copying? Is there evidence that the text was read? And if so, by whom? Such issues might seem narrowly codicological, but as soon as one raises the question of who ordered a manuscript to be written, for whom, and for what purpose, one is dealing with issues that pertain to literary and intellectual history. And once a scholar is dealing with these issues, he or she is very quickly involved with issues of literary criticism as well. For example, if the putative Vergil manuscript was glossed by an Anglo-Saxon scribe, these glosses would provide evidence that some Anglo-Saxon was concerned enough to attempt to read and gloss Vergil's poetry. This inference, however, would depend upon the assumption that these glosses were in fact available in Anglo-Saxon England or at least were an intelligent copy of some continental or Irish precursor. To say the least, these are not simple and straightforward questions, and the answer one arrives at would depend upon one's own interpretation of Vergil's poetry and one's knowledge and understanding of the tradition of commentary on the *Aeneid*. Even if the glosses in question were clearly wrong and inappropriate, the kind of error they reflected might tell us something about the study of classical texts during this period and the level of education of the scribe or scholar who was responsible

for them. The point is that there is no escaping the necessity of literary and historical judgment.

One final warning for the user of this volume concerns the complexity of the issues related to source relationships. When one considers the relationship of a given Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Latin text to its sources, the more closely one examines the relevant texts, the more problems of detail emerge. Even if certain broad patterns can be discerned and clarified, there remain anomalies of detail, problems concerning word-choice, omissions, relevant aspects of textual criticism, and so on. One of the ongoing problems in this field is that scholarly attention has focussed on certain texts almost to the exclusion of others. And those texts which have been studied in detail are the monuments of the native Germanic literary tradition whose sources must be reconstructed. Detailed source study of those texts which actually draw on known Christian-Latin literary sources is very much an ongoing project in modern Anglo-Saxon scholarship. As a result there are relatively few texts from this period which have been studied in detail in terms of their sources, and none that might not be profitably studied further. As this mode of study proceeds, it opens up new questions even as it resolves outstanding ones.

The Scope of the Entries

Given these various warnings and qualifications, it might seem that we have qualified our project out of existence; some positive statement of our goals may therefore be appropriate. The first point to emphasize is that each entry is the work of an individual scholar who is ultimately responsible for its content, and that therefore each entry is to a significant degree an individual statement. But while we emphasize the individual responsibility of our contributors and have allowed them to shape their entries in many ways, the definition of our common purpose is that each entry is intended to provide a succinct and authoritative summary of what evidence exists for the currency of a given text in Anglo-Saxon literary culture as a whole. Each contributor has had to balance the demand for a comprehensive and judicious presentation of the evidence on the one hand and the necessity for succinctness and clarity on the other. In the present volume our aim has been to be relatively brief. Our model has been Ogilvy's volume of approximately 300 pages, and we are very much aware of the larger project based in England, the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*, a project that will not merely summarize the evidence as ours does, but will present the evidence itself in some detail. The existence of this project has freed us from the

responsibility of presenting evidence or from reviewing in any detail argumentation concerning the currency and use of a given source. We do hope, however, that the bibliographical information we have gathered will permit the users to review the argumentation and available evidence for themselves relatively quickly.

We have construed "literary culture" broadly to include legal, historical, and religious literature as well as the imaginative literature with which literary scholars are conventionally concerned. In this field such a broad definition of literature is a necessary response to the fact that the literary culture of the Anglo-Saxons is fragmentarily preserved; and in any case the distinction between "imaginative" literature and other modes of literature is one which is very much a product of modern literary fashion. Even in the context of contemporary literary culture, the distinction is hard to draw, and in the literature of the Anglo-Saxon period, the distinction between literary and extra-literary genres and works would be both pointless and destructive. This is not to say that esthetic and literary discriminations cannot and should not be made, but simply that for the literary historian or the historian concerned with intellectual or religious culture, all of the available evidence is precious.

In the present volume the range of our concerns is quite wide. We are potentially concerned with the entire corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Latin written literature and with oral literature and oral genres as well. Our treatment of some of the larger topics is very succinct indeed, and one problem which does not admit of any easy solution is that it is much easier to present the evidence for the knowledge of an obscure or little-known work than for a much-used text. Here again, the authors of individual entries have exercised their best judgment and have indicated the scope of their discussion in their articles.

Apologia

In the final portion of this essay we would like to offer a prospectus concerning this kind of research and to try to make explicit the rationale for source-work in the field of Anglo-Saxon literary culture. The first point to emphasize is that Old English is a deciphered language. The ability to read Old English accurately was lost for a long time, and the ability to read it with philological accuracy was not fully recovered until the nineteenth century. The process of recovery took place over a period of centuries and was immensely facilitated by the fact that a significant portion of the corpus of Old English literature is based upon readily accessible Latin sources.

These texts remain the most important source of information about what Old English words mean and about what given syntactical devices imply; and the task of Anglo-Saxon lexicography was begun by Anglo-Saxon scribes who glossed difficult Latin words with vernacular equivalents. Any extended study of Old English language or literature which does not consider the problem of sources is in a sense rootless, since our knowledge of the language is so heavily dependent on the cultural interweaving of Latin and Anglo-Saxon in this period. From the perspective of the literary critic and the literary historian, those texts that are most heavily dependent on Latin sources are usually of least intellectual and esthetic merit; but from that of the linguist or the Anglo-Saxonist of any scholarly persuasion who is attempting to explain a difficult word or locution, those Anglo-Saxon texts that have a known Latin source are a crucial linguistic resource without which our knowledge of the language would be much less assured than it is. And obviously the linguist or historian who cites the Latin *Vorlage* of a given Old English text is using either the source scholarship of some predecessor, or offering his or her own.

If the most immediate value of source scholarship is to enable us to understand Old English as a language, the further value of such scholarship for the intellectual and literary historian is no less fundamental. The immediate questions of literary and intellectual history—what the Anglo-Saxons knew and believed about themselves and their world—can best be addressed by detailed study of those texts which the Anglo-Saxons composed or compiled or copied. And in studying such texts it is impossible to proceed very far without facing issues of source scholarship. Tracing the filiations of one text with another is often laborious, but it can be very enlightening. Even the disjunctions, the gaps where one might expect a relationship, can be suggestive, and the larger patterns that emerge when one traces the relationship of one text with its sources can be strikingly revealing. J.E. Cross has spoken of “going close” to one’s text, and there are moments in source study when one has the eerie sense of almost eavesdropping on the thoughts and hesitations of an author who may be nameless and has been dead for many hundred years, but whose characteristic voice and intellectual preferences are gradually becoming clear.

In considering scholarly and critical discourse about Anglo-Saxon literary culture in relationship to its sources, it is possible to discern two positions which, with some polemical exaggeration, we will call “maximalist” and “minimalist.” The maximalists tend to accentuate the depth and the breadth of Anglo-Saxon literary culture, to take for granted a relatively wide degree of literary Christian-Latin culture and acquaintance with Classical culture. For better or worse, Ogilvy with his concern for libraries and Latin manuscripts was a maximalist, and many of the great Anglo-Saxonists

of the first generations of Old English literary scholarship tended toward this position. One thinks of A.S. Cook or Fr. Klaeber, who never hesitated in their belief that the Anglo-Saxons were a deeply literate and literary people. By contrast (and in part in reaction to such assumptions) other scholars have emphasized the enormous obstacles which the Anglo-Saxons faced in attempting to perpetuate a literary culture and have focussed on the very substantial evidence that exists to show the sharp limitations on Anglo-Saxon learning. One eminent and authoritative contemporary Anglo-Saxonist has recently argued, for example, that we must take Alfred quite literally when he says that there were no literate persons, lay or clergy, in large portions of Anglo-Saxon England in his youth. This “minimalism” is, for the literary scholar at least, a less congenial view of the literary culture of the period, but precisely because it is less congenial its implications must be faced directly.

The debate between these two perspectives is an ongoing one, and there is no reason to believe it will be concluded any time in the immediate future. At the risk of seeming to lack zeal for controversy, we would like to suggest a *via media* that grants a certain cogency to both perspectives, and that we would call “particularist.” We would begin by granting the enormous problems which the Anglo-Saxons faced in acquiring, disseminating, and transmitting literary culture whether in Latin or the vernacular. The Anglo-Saxons were presumably generally illiterate before they were converted to Christianity; there is some truth in the old and nationalistic saying that the Irish taught the English to write. After the conversion, the Anglo-Saxons could acquire literary skills and literary culture, but it is difficult to know how many of them chose to do so. The literacy rate in Anglo-Saxon England is unknown and unknowable; but lay literacy is often associated with mercantile culture, and the urban population of Anglo-Saxon England was relatively small. The presumption must be that only a minority of Anglo-Saxons were ever literate even in their own language. And if Latin was a learned language everywhere in Europe, Anglo-Saxons were handicapped in comparison with the speakers of the various romance vernaculars in that their mother tongue was quite different from Latin. In addition to the immediate practical difficulties of learning Latin and copying and disseminating Latin manuscripts in the Anglo-Saxon speaking world, Anglo-Saxons concerned with literary culture faced an even larger problem in that learning was threatened by constant internal warfare and after 793 by the threat of pagan Viking raiders, who had no scruples about destroying churches and monasteries.

The list of potential threats to Anglo-Saxon literary culture could be prolonged, and it is certainly easy to find evidence for ignorance and barbarism in the written records of the Anglo-Saxons. There is, however, one

immediate counter-argument so salient that it is sometimes overlooked. Christianity is for better or worse a religion of the book. Without a certain degree of literary culture, Christianity, at least Latin Catholic Christianity, could not continue to exist. It is possible to imagine an illiterate or semi-literate priest who fulfilled the functions expected of him by memorizing the Latin words of the canon of the mass and the other most important liturgical texts by rote with only a minimal understanding of what he was saying. But it is very difficult to imagine how such a priest could train a successor. It would therefore follow that an aspirant to the clergy would have good reason to seek out a more learned cleric for his education. It is of course true that a priest or monk need not be an intellectual or a particularly learned man in order to fulfill his office. But Christian education and the continual necessity of training younger generations of clergy demanded a certain degree of Latin and vernacular literary culture. Christianity did not take root everywhere in the early Middle Ages; there were numerous missions which failed, and it is perfectly imaginable that the pagan Anglo-Saxons newly converted to Christianity might have relapsed into the non-literate pagan Germanic culture which they traditionally had practiced. But for the most part they did not. Anglo-Saxon England converted to Christianity and remained Christian, and the consequence was that there existed a milieu, clerical for the most part but to some degree lay, in which literary culture could exist and in which, at the least, there was a tradition of respect for learning and an interest in the transmission of texts. In considering barbarian Anglo-Saxon England from such a perspective, the continued existence of any native literary culture at all either in Latin or Old English represents a substantial achievement, and instances of error and naive ignorance are much more understandable. The Anglo-Saxons, however, did not simply acquire sufficient literacy for a native Christian tradition to exist and perpetuate itself. Within three generations of the conversion there were Anglo-Saxon Christians whose learning and knowledge of Latin were comparable to those of any scholar in Europe. The achievement of Bede would be remarkable in any age, but when one remembers that his grandparents were probably born before the coming of Christianity to Northumbria, it brings his achievement into sharper focus. It is thus a matter of historical fact that some Anglo-Saxons attained a very high level of Latin literary culture in places and times in which one might not have expected it. It is also of course true that the Anglo-Saxons faced formidable problems in acquiring and transmitting literary culture; and we, as particularists, would argue that every Anglo-Saxon text be approached individually and as far as possible without preconceptions either maximalist or minimalist. As a practical matter, Anglo-Saxonists will have to be practicing maximalists when they first approach an Anglo-Saxon liter-

ary text, in that one must test every possible hypothesis about sources and influence before dismissing it; but in deference to the minimalist position we must remind readers that no single library in Anglo-Saxon England possessed all of the books listed in our present volume. Indeed, the fact that an author is mentioned and an entry listed in the present volume does not necessarily mean that "this book was known to the Anglo-Saxons," but rather that there is evidence of at least one Anglo-Saxon's having known it, either directly or indirectly— a much more limited and localized proposition. It may also be mentioned in passing that our silence does not prove a given text was not known, but simply that we did not know of any evidence for it.

A prospectus ordinarily includes an invitation to scholars at large, and we would like to make such an invitation in pointing out that the work of tracing the sources of Anglo-Saxon literary culture is very much in progress and that there is much to be done. We hope to be able to publish ongoing revisions of these entries under the auspices of the *Old English Newsletter*, and we hope the more obvious deficiencies of our volume will be corrected in an ongoing process of correction and revision that will extend beyond the date of formal publication.

A question that historians enjoy debating is whether the advent of the Norman conquest involved a radical break with Anglo-Saxon culture and political institutions and whether one defines the relationship between the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman eras in terms of rupture or continuity. Even accepting the most radical account of the changes which William and his successors worked, however, these changes are trivial in comparison with those that had already occurred in the development of Anglo-Saxon culture and the Anglo-Saxon polity. A scattered and fragmented group of tribes had been joined together to form one nation; these Germanic peoples had become Christian and as a result literate. Any story must have a beginning, and the beginning of the history of England and the English-speaking nations begins with the Anglo-Saxons. For better or worse, "England" became inhabited by the "English," the "English" became Christian during our period, and the consequences of these events are still being felt. The study of the sources of Anglo-Saxon literary culture may sometimes seem pedestrian and it is often difficult, but this kind of scholarship can provide genuine insight into the intelligence and aspirations of men and women who lived a millennium ago, spoke our language, and created the foundations of our culture. And this is no small reward.

Thomas D. Hill

Guide for Readers

The *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture* follows its immediate predecessor, J.D.A. Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English, 597-1066 [BKE]*, in organizing its material primarily as an alphabetical list of authors, accepting current scholarly usage for the forms of the names rather than changing all to either Latin or English. Bede's hagiographical works, for example, are found under Bede and not in the *Acta Sanctorum* entry. Major entries on writers such as Bede that include more than one work may treat each title as a separate entry under the author. Works that modern scholars conventionally identify as by, for example, "pseudo-Bede" follow the author in question, and are in turn followed, when there is significant evidence, by entries on the Old English translations of an author—see, for example, the entry on the Old English translation of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*. Anonymous works are either grouped under generic entries, or are included alphabetically by the first word—other than a preposition—of the title in the list of authors. Generic entries may also include a single work by a named author if this is the only one work by the author known in Anglo-Saxon England: in these cases cross-references will be provided.

The *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*, unlike Ogilvy's volume, is the work of many scholars who have their own ways of presenting material. Some flexibility is necessary since entries on Augustine and Ephraem, or on hymns and the *Heliand* obviously present different problems. Writers, particularly of major entries, often provide introductory remarks calling attention to any peculiar features of their task. Recent scholarship, however, makes it possible to present systematically in a headnote some basic information about the knowledge or use of certain sources in Anglo-Saxon England. An abbreviation immediately following the author and/or title makes it unnecessary to repeat bibliographical information about the best edition of a work. For Latin texts, the abbreviation is from Michael Lapidge's *Abbreviations for Sources and Specification of Standard Editions for Sources*, the relevant parts of which appear in alphabetical order by abbreviation in Part I of the Bibliography at the end of this volume. For Old English texts, the

abbreviation is from the system devised for the Toronto *Dictionary of Old English* as listed in the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English* [MCOE], a refinement of the system designed by Angus Cameron [AC]; see, however, Appendix A for the Old English *Martyrology*. Similarly references to standard research tools, such as the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* [CPL], often make it unnecessary to provide much information about the source itself. Moreover, it is usually possible to present in a headnote five kinds of information that indicate that a work was available in Anglo-Saxon England:

MSS *Manuscripts*. The inclusion of a work in a relevant manuscript provides firm physical evidence for its presence in Anglo-Saxon England. Helmut Gneuss' "Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100" [HG] provides the basis for this source of information: all contributors have been asked to use it fully, and to query Professor Gneuss when they notice potential discrepancies. We are grateful to Professor Gneuss for allowing us to use his work and for bearing with our questions. In two areas, however, his concerns do not exactly match our needs. First, the list does not yet fully identify the contents of each manuscript, and so writers have sometimes gone back to the catalogs—and occasionally to microfilms or to the manuscripts themselves—in order to develop this evidence. Second, there are some continental manuscripts that either by their script or by some other feature show that a work may have been known in Anglo-Saxon circles.

Lists *Booklists*. Although less informative than a surviving manuscript, the mention of a work in wills, lists of donations, or inventories of libraries from our period provides a good indication that it was known. In "Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England" [ML] Michael Lapidge edits the remaining catalogs of manuscripts from our period, and identifies, whenever possible, the work in question. The following shortened titles are used to refer to these lists: 1. Alcuin; 2. King Athelstan; 3. Athelstan (grammarian); 4. Æthelwold; 5. Ælfwold; 6. Sherburn-in-Elmet; 7. Bury St Edmunds I; 8. Sæwold; 9. Worcester I; 10. Leofric; 11. Worcester II; 12. Bury St Edmunds II; and 13. Peterborough. For a discussion of these lists—and specifically of difficulties of localizing the second list associated with Worcester and the Peterborough list—see ML.

A-S Vers *Anglo-Saxon Versions*. Like the manuscript evidence, an Anglo-Saxon version, either in Old English or in Latin, indicates that the source was known to the English at this time. The MCOE provides the basis for identifying the Old English texts. Anglo-Latin texts are identified by the abbreviations in Part I of the Bibliography. Writers of individual entries

have, of course, exercised judgment in how to represent the information when a translation or adaptation is quite loose, or when the use of a source is so limited that it is better considered a quotation.

Quots/Cits *Quotations or Citations*. The source notes of modern critical editions can make it clear that Anglo-Saxon writers knew a work in full or in some shortened form. A citation, including both the name and the words of an author, is sometimes significant since it shows the knowledge of the origin of an idea or phrase. Writers of entries have used their judgment in determining which quotations and citations significantly further the evidence for the knowledge of a work during our period. For example, listing each use by Bede of Augustine's *De genesi ad litteram* may well be less significant for our purposes than indicating a single, anonymous use of a more obscure work. If the quotation or citation is noted in the edition specified in Part I of the Bibliography, or in the MCOE, only the primary references—using the system for citing texts described later under *Standard Editions*—to the Anglo-Saxon writer and to the source are provided. If the quotation or citation is not noted in the specified edition, the primary references are noted in the same way in the headnote, and the secondary source will be mentioned in the narrative body of the entry. In order not to overlap with the developing database of the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*, this volume will not ordinarily include source identifications published after 1987.

Refs *References*. Although always open to interpretation, a specific reference by an Anglo-Saxon writer to the author or work may indicate its presence in England during our period. The letters of Boniface and his circle provide good examples of this kind of evidence. Editions are referred to in the same way as quotes/cits.

Although schematic, the information in the headnote summarizes much of the strongest evidence for the knowledge of a specific author or work in Anglo-Saxon England.

The body of the entry discusses any information in the headnote that requires clarification or amplification, and then introduces other kinds of evidence for the knowledge of a work in Anglo-Saxon England, such as allusions in literary texts or distinctive iconographic motifs from the visual arts. One kind of evidence that may be considered in this section—and that requires some specific comment here—is the presence of echoes in hexametrical poetry. Within this poetic tradition, the terms "quotation" and "citation" are restricted either to entire lines taken from a previous work, or to situations in which the Anglo-Saxon author calls attention to the source

with a phrase such as "as the poet says": these quotations and citations are included in the headnote. In contrast, an "echo" in hexametrical poetry consists of at least two words occurring in the same metrical feet (but not necessarily in the same grammatical form) in both the source and the Anglo-Saxon text: these are discussed in the body. A similar distinction between "quotations and citations" and "echoes" may be preserved in the case of some prose writers. Finally, the body of an entry may consider other questions, such as the temporal and geographical extent of the use of a work. Readers are directed to other entries in the volume—and through these entries to information about the standard edition in Part I of the Bibliography—by names in small capitals.

Entries may conclude with a discussion of bibliography, which attempts to be complete through 1987 but which may include later works other than source identifications (see Quots/Cits above). If for some reason the edition of the work in question cannot be included in Part I of the Bibliography, or if other editions need to be considered, references by editor and date are recorded here, and can be expanded by turning to Part II of the Bibliography. Part II of the Bibliography also includes relevant secondary material mentioned in the entries by author and date. GR numbers can be expanded by consulting Stanley B. Greenfield and Fred C. Robinson, *A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature to the end of 1972* (Toronto 1980). The bibliography may conclude with any relevant comments and suggestions about work in progress or desiderata.

Thus, most entries use the following format:

AUTHOR and/or TITLE [abbreviation]: references to research tools; cross references to other entries.

(introductory remarks)

TITLE of individual work [abbreviation]: references to research tools; cross references to other entries.

MSS Manuscripts: by city, library and MS number, but keyed to a secondary source, usually HG.

Lists Booklists: by the name or place associated with the list, with reference to the list and item numbers in ML.

A-S Vers Anglo-Saxon Versions: Old English by the abbreviation in the MCOE, with the full AC number; Anglo-Latin by the abbreviation in Part I of the Bibliography.

Quots/Cits Significant Quotations or Citations: Old English by the abbreviation in the MCOE, with the full AC number; Anglo-Latin by the abbreviation in Part I of the Bibliography. The source follows the reference to the Anglo-Saxon writer, and the system for citing texts is described below under *Standard Editions*.

Refs Significant References: Old English by the abbreviation in the MCOE, with the full AC number; Anglo-Latin by the abbreviation in Part I of the Bibliography.

Body

Bibliographical discussion

The system of cross-referencing by using small capitals is complicated enough to require some comment here. In the case of a work by a known author, this system should provide little difficulty: both the name of the author and the title of the work (possibly in a shortened form) will be in small capitals the first time that they appear in an entry (including entries under either a major author or a generic gathering). References to anonymous works gathered into generic entries present greater problems. In these situations, the title of the work will appear in small capitals, and a reference to the name of the generic gathering will accompany the first mention of the work in each entry (but *not necessarily* including individual entries under either a major author or a generic gathering). Thus the first time one encounters a reference in the "Acta Sanctorum" to the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary," COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY will be in small capitals, and will be followed with the direction to "see LEGENDARIES," where in the final volume there will be an entry on this collection; in subsequent entries in the "Acta Sanctorum," COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY will be in small capitals the first time it appears, but there may be no further direction to "see LEGENDARIES." If the title of a work provides little information about the generic entry under which it can be found, the reference to the gathering may always be kept. The most difficult problem in cross-referencing that has arisen in this trial volume, however, is presented by the evidence from the VERCELLI and BLICKLING collections of anonymous homilies. Donald Scragg discusses both in his entry on ANONYMOUS OLD ENGLISH HOMILIES (see HOMILIARIES), and goes into some detail about a number of items from each, and so the reader should be directed to this information; however, in many entries references to items in either collection are limited to abbreviations from the MCOE, and in these cases it seems unnecessarily cumbersome to follow each with "see ANONYMOUS OLD ENGLISH HOMILIES under HOMILIARIES."

Therefore the reader should remember that an abbreviation such as *HomS* 4 (*VercHom* 9) can be pursued further in the volume by turning to Scragg's work.

Standard Research Tools

The following abbreviations are used throughout the volume. When items are individually numbered in these works, references are to items (or to volume and item; e.g. *CLA* 2.139); otherwise, references are to pages (or to volume and page; e.g. *OTP* 2.249-95).

AC = Angus Cameron "A List of Old English Texts" in *A Plan for the Dictionary of Old English* ed. Roberta Frank and Cameron (Toronto, 1973) 27-306.

BCLL = *Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature 400-1200* Michael Lapidge and Richard Sharpe (Dublin, 1985).

BEH = *Bibliography of English History to 1485* ed. Edgar B. Graves (Oxford, 1975).

BHG = *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca* 3rd ed., François Halkin (Brussels, 1951; *Subsidia hagiographica* 8a).

BHG^a = *Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae* François Halkin (Brussels, 1969; *Subsidia hagiographica* 47).

BHG^{na} = *Novum Auctarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae* François Halkin (Brussels, 1984; *Subsidia hagiographica* 65).

BHL = *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* 2 vols. (Brussels 1898-1901; *Subsidia hagiographica* 6); with supplements in 1911 (*Subsidia hagiographica* 12) and 1986 (*Subsidia hagiographica* 70).

BHM = *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta* 4 vols. in 7 parts, *Instrumenta Patristica* 4, Bernard Lambert (Steenbrugge, 1969-72).

BKE = *Books Known to the English, 597-1066* J.D.A. Ogilvy (Cambridge, MA, 1967); and addenda and corrigenda in *Mediaevalia* 7 (1984 for 1981) 281-325; also available as *Old English Newsletter Subsidia* 11 (1985).

BLS = *Butler's Lives of the Saints* 4 vols., ed. Herbert Thurston and Donald Attwater (New York, 1963).

BSS = *Bibliotheca Sanctorum* 13 vols. (Rome, 1961-70).

CLA = *Codices Latini Antiquiores* 11 vols., E.A. Lowe (Oxford, 1934-66); with a supplement (1971); 2nd ed. of vol. 2 (1972).

CPG = *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* 4 vols., M. Geerard (Turnhout, 1974-83).

CPL = *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* 2nd ed., E. Dekkers and A. Gaar (Steenbrugge, 1961).

DACL = *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 15 vols., ed. F. Cabrol (Paris, 1907-53).

DB = *Dictionary of the Bible* 4 vols. and an extra vol., ed. James Hastings (New York, 1900-05).

DHGE = *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* ed. A. Baudrillart, A. de Meyer, É. Van Cauwenbergh, and R. Aubert (Paris, 1912-).

DMA = *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* 12 vols., ed. Joseph R. Strayer (New York, 1982-89).

DS = *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* ed. M. Viller and others (Paris, 1932-).

DTC = *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 15 vols., ed. A. Vacant, E. Mangenot and É. Amann (Paris, 1908-50).

DTC^{ns} = *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique. Tables générales* ed. B. Loth and A. Michel (Paris, 1953-72).

EHD = *English Historical Documents: Volume 1 c. 500-1042* 2nd ed., ed. Dorothy Whitelock (London, 1979).

GR = Stanley B. Greenfield and Fred C. Robinson *A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature to the end of 1972* (Toronto, 1980).

HG = Helmut Gneuss "A Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1100" *Anglo-Saxon England* 9 (1981) 1-60.

IASIM = *Insular and Anglo-Saxon Illuminated Manuscripts. An Iconographic Catalogue* Thomas H. Ohlgren (New York, 1986).

ICL = *Initia Carminum Latinorum Saeculo Undecimo Antiquiorum* D. Schaller and E. Könsgen (Göttingen, 1977).

ICVL = *Initia Carminum Ac Versuum Medii Aevi Posterioris Latinorum* Hans Walther (Göttingen, 1959).

ISLMAH = *Index Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi Hispanorum* Manuel C. Díaz y Díaz (Madrid, 1959).

KVS = *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel Vetus Latina* 1/1, Hermann Josef Frede (Freiburg, 1981); *Kirchenschriftsteller. Aktualisierungsheft 1984* (Freiburg, 1984); and *Kirchenschriftsteller. Aktualisierungsheft 1988* (Freiburg, 1988).

LTK = *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 2nd ed., 10 vols. and an index, ed. Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner (Freiburg i.B., 1957-67).

MCOE = *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English: The List of Texts and Index of Editions* compiled by Antonette diPaolo Healey and Richard L. Venezky (Toronto, 1980).

ML = Michael Lapidge "Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England" in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England* ed. Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985).

NCE = *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 17 vols., ed. William J. McDonald and others (New York, 1967-79).

NRK = N.R. Ker *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957); with a supplement in *Anglo-Saxon England* 5 (1976) 121-31; and addenda and corrigenda by Mary Blockley in *Notes & Queries* ns 29 (1982) 1-3.

NTA = Edgar Hennecke *New Testament Apocrypha* 2 vols., ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher and trans. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia, 1963-65).

OCD = *Oxford Classical Dictionary* 2nd ed., N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Sculard (Oxford, 1970).

ODCC = *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* 2nd ed., F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (London, 1974).

OTP = *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2 vols., ed. James H. Charlesworth (London, 1983-85).

RBMA = *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* 11 vols., F. Stegmüller (Madrid, 1950-).

SC = *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* 7 vols., Falconer Madan and H.H.E. Craster (Oxford, 1895-1953).

SEHI = *Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical* James F. Kenney (1929; rpt New York, 1966 with addenda by L. Bieler).

Standard Editions

Unless otherwise noted, the following system for citing texts is used:

1. Old English poetic texts are referred to by the abbreviation in the *MCOE* and AC with line numbers from the *ASPR*.

2. References to Old English prose texts are to the edition specified in the *MCOE*. For a text which is line numbered as a unit in the edition cited, only line numbers follow the abbreviation. For a text in which sections (e.g. books or chapters) are line numbered separately, sectional divisions are in roman (upper case for larger divisions, e.g. books, lower case for smaller ones, e.g. chapters) followed by line numbers (e.g. II.xx.3-4). For a text line numbered by page (or column) or not provided with line numbers in the edition cited, page (or column) and line numbers are used (e.g. 26.1-15 or 37.6-42.4).

3. The headnote refers to Latin editions by the abbreviations expanded in Part I of the Bibliography. The system for citing sections, pages, and lines is the same as used for Old English prose texts (above).

4. References to the Bible are to the *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* 2nd ed., ed. R. Weber (Stuttgart, 1975).

The following abbreviations for standard series are also used; these abbreviations may be followed by volume and page (or column) numbers (e.g. *PL* 33.45).

AH = *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi* 55 vols., ed. Guido Maria Dreves and Clemens Blume (Leipzig, 1886-1922).

- AS* = *Acta Sanctorum* 3rd ed., by the Bollandists (Paris, 1863-).
- ASPR* = *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* 6 vols., ed. G.P. Krapp and E.V.K. Dobbie (New York, 1931-53).
- BaP* = *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa* 13 vols., Christian W.M. Grein, Richard P. Wülker, and Hans Hecht, eds (Kassel, 1872-1933).
- CCCM* = *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis* (Turnhout, 1966-).
- CCSA* = *Corpus Christianorum, Series Apocryphorum* (Turnhout, 1983-).
- CCSL* = *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (Turnhout, 1953-).
- CSEL* = *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, 1866-).
- EEMF* = *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* (Copenhagen, 1951-).
- EETS* = *Early English Texts Society*.
 ES = Extra Series.
 OS = Original Series.
 SS = Supplementary Series.
- GCS* = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1897-).
- GL* = *Grammatici Latini* 8 vols., ed. H. Keil (Leipzig, 1857-80).
- HBS* = *Henry Bradshaw Society* (London, 1891-).
- MGH* = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.
 AA = *Auctores antiquissimi*.
 CAC = *Concilia aevi carolini*.
 ECA = *Epistolae carolini aevi*.
 ES = *Epistolae selectae*.
 PLAC = *Poetae latini aevi carolini*.
 SRM = *Scriptores rerum merovingicarum*.
- PG* = *Patrologia Graeca* 161 vols., ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1857-66).
- PL* = *Patrologia Latina* 221 vols., ed. J.P. Migne (Paris, 1844-64).

- PLS* = *Patrologiae Latinae Supplementum* 5 vols., ed. A. Hamman (Paris, 1958-74).
- RS* = "Rolls Series"; *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* (London, 1858-96).
- SChr* = *Sources chrétiennes* (Paris, 1940-).
- SS* = *The Publications of the Surtees Society* (London, 1835-).
- TU* = *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Archiv für die griechisch-christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1882-).

Frederick M. Biggs